GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response
The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

(i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question’s terms
(ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
(iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
(iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
(v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level
The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate’s ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

Assessing Quality of Written Communication
QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate’s history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.
Part (a)

Target: AO2a (8%)  (20 marks)
As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Comprehends the surface features of the sources and selects material relevant to the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |      | **Low Level 1: 1-2 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth. |
|       |      | **High Level 1: 3-5 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed. |
| 2     | 6-10 | Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify their similarities and/or differences in relation to the question posed. There may be one developed comparison, but most comparisons will be undeveloped or unsupported with material from the sources. Sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information. The source provenance may be noted, without application of its implications to the source content. |
|       |      | **Low Level 2: 6-7 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth. |
|       |      | **High Level 2: 8-10 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed. |
| 3     | 11-15| Comprehends the sources and focuses the cross-referencing on the task set. Responses will offer detailed comparisons, similarities/differences, agreements/disagreements that are supported by evidence drawn from the sources. Sources are used as evidence with some consideration of their attributes, such as the nature, origins, purpose or audience, with some consideration of how this can affect the weight given to the evidence. In addressing ‘how far’ there is a clear attempt to use the sources in combination, but this may be imbalanced in terms of the issues addressed or in terms of the use of the sources. |
|       |      | **Low Level 3: 11-12 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth. |
|       |      | **High Level 3: 13-15 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed. |
Reaches a judgement in relation to the issue posed by the question supported by careful examination of the evidence of the sources. The sources are cross-referenced and the elements of challenge and corroboration are analysed. The issues raised by the process of comparison are used to address the specific enquiry. The attributes of the source are taken into account in order to establish what weight the content they will bear in relation to the specific enquiry. In addressing ‘how far’ the sources are used in combination.

**Low Level 4: 16-17 marks**
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.

**High Level 4: 18-20 marks**
The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.

NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

**Part (b)**

**Target: AO1a & AO1b (10% - 24 marks)**
Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

**AO2b (7% - 16 marks)**
Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.

(40 marks)

**AO1a and AO1b (24 marks)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;As per descriptor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2     | 7-12 | Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant factual material. The analytical focus will
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be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between the simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far.

**Low Level 2: 7-8 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth  
**Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks**  
As per descriptor.  
**High Level 2: 11-12 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.

The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.

| Level 3 | 13-18 | Candidates’ answers will attempt analysis and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question’s focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will mostly be accurate but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor.  
**Low Level 3: 13-14 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.  
**Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks**  
As per descriptor.  
**High Level 3: 17-18 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.  
The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present. |
| Level 4 | 19-24 | Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.  
**Low Level 4: 19-20 marks**  
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.  
**Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks**  
As per descriptor.  
**High Level 4: 23-24 marks**  
The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4. |
The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.

NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication
Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

AO2b (16 marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | 1-4  | Comprehends the sources and selects material relevant to the representation contained in the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.  

**Low Level 1**: 1-2 marks  
The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 1**: 3-4 marks  
The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed. |
| 2     | 5-8  | Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the representation contained in the question. When supporting the decision made in relation to the question the sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information.  

**Low Level 2**: 5-6 marks  
The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 2**: 7-8 marks  
The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed. |
| 3     | 9-12 | The sources are analysed and points of challenge and/or support for the representation contained in the question are developed from the provided material. In addressing the specific enquiry, there is clear awareness that a representation is under discussion and there is evidence of reasoning from the evidence of both sources, although there may be some lack of balance. The response reaches a judgement in relation to the claim which is supported by the evidence of the sources.  

**Low Level 3**: 9-10 marks  
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth. |
High Level 3: 11-12 marks
The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.

4 13-16
Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from the issues raised by the process of analysing the representation in the sources. There is developed reasoning and weighing of the evidence in order to create a judgement in relation to the stated claim.

Low Level 4: 13-14 marks
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.

High Level 4: 15-16 marks
The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.

NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Unit 2 Assessment Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>AO1a and b Marks</th>
<th>AO2a Marks</th>
<th>AO2b Marks</th>
<th>Total marks for question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q (a)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q (b)(i) or (ii)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Marks</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% weighting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**E1 British Political History, 1945-90: Consensus and Conflict**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (a)</td>
<td>Candidates will probably start with Source 3 as this sets out in unambiguous terms the achievements of the Conservative government under Thatcher. Undoubtedly candidates will note the provenance of the source, although the more knowledgeable will be aware that Thatcher’s resignation was expected and that her speech was, therefore, something of a valedictory address. Similarly, most candidates will be aware that Sources 1 and 2 are by political opponents of the Prime Minister and are consequently critical of her time in office. However, it should be noted that both the sources contain some reference to success; this is most marked in Source 2 and, bearing in mind its context, is indicative of a not insubstantial level of achievement. The more perceptive candidates will be able to cross-reference the criticisms raised in Sources 1 and 2 and recognise that they are both directed towards the Conservatives’ focus on ‘rolling back the state’ and the impact of Thatcherite financial policies. At the higher levels, there should be an awareness that, to an extent, the substance of many of the criticisms in Sources 1 and 2 are, in fact, alluded to by Thatcher herself in Source 3 when they are turned into positives and viewed as either providing more opportunity for people or not living at the expense of the future. Thus, in arriving at a judgement the very best responses will recognise that in many areas ‘success’ will depend not just on outcomes but also aims.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The focus of the question is on the reasons behind the Labour victory in 1945. There should be a clear awareness of the debate that surrounds this topic, in particular the relative importance that is attached to the long-term shift towards the socialist agenda as opposed to the short-term mismanagement of the election by the Conservatives generally and Churchill specifically. Source 4 highlights some of the miscalculations which undermined the Conservative Party’s electioneering and the extent to which Churchill was central to their campaign as a whole. This view can be cross-referenced with Dalton’s memoirs in Source 6, which emphasise the importance which contemporaries attached to Churchill’s personality as a determining factor in the outcome of the election and suggest that, far from being ‘a foregone conclusion’, the result seemed to be too close to call. Those operating at higher levels will be able to use the provenance of the source to buttress further the counter-argument to the contention in the question by showing that, even in the higher reaches of the Labour Party, not only was the landslide not predicted but victory itself was in doubt. The more knowledgeable candidates will be able to develop the impact the campaigning had on the outcome of the election by contrasting the Conservatives’ approach with the Labour Party’s focus on policies, and in particular the two key issues of housing and employment. Source 5 shifts the emphasis away from the short-term and provides candidates with a platform to present the counter-view. Again the more knowledgeable candidates should be able to develop some of the themes raised in the source regarding the growth of collectivism and the public’s heightened expectations of life in post-war Britain. More perceptive candidates may also recognise that the sources are by no means contradictory, with all three, directly or indirectly, alluding to Churchill’s centrality to, and the Conservatives’ poor management of, the campaign and none discounting (and Source 5 explicitly asserting) the importance of long-term structural changes in the political make-up of the British voting public. Achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the reasons why Churchill and the Conservatives were rejected in 1945, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (b) (ii)</td>
<td>The question is focused on the period of Conservative rule between 1951 and 1964 and the extent to which there was a continuation of the post-war consensus. Candidates may well start with Source 8 which firmly supports the contention in the question and the more knowledgeable will be able to develop some of the similarities in policies towards employment and the Unions which are raised in the source. They may also highlight the similarities between Gaitskell and Butler by noting the opposition both faced from the more extreme within their own parties. However, the more perceptive candidates will appreciate the satirical tone of the piece and will, therefore, treat it with some caution. Source 9 can be used both to support and challenge the view in the question. Although the parties’ conflicting views on the extent of public ownership are revealed, there is, nonetheless, a grudging acknowledgement of the Tories’ acceptance of the nationalisation programme as it stands. Source 7 can be used as a platform for the counter-arguments and the reference to ‘goals’ may well be picked up on to explore the differences in ideological approach at the heart of many of the policies. From their own knowledge candidates can expand on the points raised in the sources and extend the range of points to include such areas as: the continuation of the Welfare State; the shared belief in a Keynesian approach to economic management; the differences in tax policy; the tentative beginnings of denationalisation. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the nature and extent of the similarities in the two parties’ policies in this period, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 (a) Candidates may well start with Source 11 which suggests that the Beatles were popular because they recaptured the sense of youth rebellion which had characterised Rock and Roll in the 1950s. This view can then be cross-referenced with Sources 10 and 12 which both highlight the extent to which adolescent disenchantment found a voice in popular music. Some candidates may also use their knowledge of the times to site the sources in their cultural and economic context; for example the growing disillusionment with authority in the light of high unemployment in Source 12. Candidates can, however, also challenge the contention in the question by reference to all three sources. Source 10 emphasises the importance of the commercialisation of the music industry with the targeting of the youth market by record companies. Again the strength of this argument can be evaluated by placing the source in the context of the growing affluence of teenagers in the 1950s. Candidates may also note that Source 10 points to the importance of ‘belonging’ as a factor in the success of popular music, something which is alluded to in Source 12: ‘So it wasn’t just me’. Source 11 stresses another significant factor behind the popularity of the Beatles, their roots in Rock and Roll and general air of ‘excitement’. Candidates may also make use of the provenance of the sources and note that the audiences for Sources 10 and 11 are very different, with The Times addressing a largely middle-aged readership and taking the long view, while Source 11 is aimed at a teenage interest in style and attitude. Some candidates may also cast doubt on the veracity of Source 12, with the focus on comic entertainment affecting the tone if not the content of Steel’s autobiography. The best answers will concentrate on the extent of support on the basis of precisely selected evidence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (b) (i)</td>
<td>The focus of the question is on the relationship between the film industry and social attitudes, in particular the role and position of women. Candidates will most likely access Source 14 as a starting point for the argument in favour of the contention in the question. The source emphasises the growing trend in the new wave of British films to challenge women’s domestic roles, concentrating instead on female independence and sexuality. Candidates may also note that the challenge to women’s traditional place in society also comes through the casting of actresses in ‘leading roles’. Support for this line of argument is developed further by inference in Source 13 with the reference to a ‘casual attitude to abortion’. Candidates should, however, be able to qualify the extent to which film did question traditional gender roles by reference to both Sources 13 and 14. Source 13 points out the ‘social responsibility’ that film-makers were meant to shoulder, and it should be noted here that the source description makes clear that the abortion scene was altered in the light of the censor’s comments. Source 14 documents that society was becoming ‘increasingly permissive' and, therefore, suggests that rather than questioning the existing status-quo, the new wave of films was merely reflecting a cultural shift. From their own knowledge candidates should be aware of the social and cultural changes that were taking place in the 1950s and 1960s, and in particular they could point to the growing affluence and influence of youth culture. (Indeed, both sources highlight the film industry’s focus on youth.) Thus, candidates should place any attack on gender roles in the wider context of an increasing questioning of traditional society. The more perceptive will be aware that <em>Saturday Night, Sunday Morning</em> tackled class and generational issues rather than gender. It may also be noted that the films referred to in the sources were from the so-called British ‘New Wave’ and that films with more traditional areas of focus remained hugely popular throughout this period - <em>Reach for the Sky</em>, <em>Bridge on the River Kwai</em>, <em>Lawrence of Arabia</em>, <em>Man for All Seasons</em>, <em>Richard III</em>. Achievement at higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the relationship between social change and the film industry, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement of the given view.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Indicative content</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (b) (ii)</td>
<td>The focus of the question is on the impact of media exposure on the public’s perception of the royal family. Source 15 firmly supports the view that the image of the monarchy declined especially with the advent of television coverage, although the reference to revelations surrounding Charles and Diana leaves plenty of scope for candidates to include other forms of media, particularly the written press. This can then be taken up by reference to Source 16 where the <em>Independent</em>, a paper that normally eschewed anything relating to Buckingham Palace, is not only pointing out the declining public respect for the monarchy but also exemplifying it by questioning the royal family’s traditionally restrained mourning rituals in the wake of Princess Diana’s death. Source 17 puts the case for the opposing view, with the popularity of the televised coverage of two key royal ceremonies being used as evidence of the public’s continued admiration for the monarchy as an institution and the propagation of a positive image generally. The more perceptive candidates will be aware that the sources are referring to different time periods and, hence, should be able to point out that the more deferential tone adopted by television in the 1970s (Source 17) gave way to greater informality in the 1980s (Source 15) and finally to a direct questioning in the 1990s as Charles and Diana’s marriage failed (Sources 15 and 16). Thus, although presenting conflicting opinions, the sources are not necessarily contradictory. From their own knowledge candidates should be able to develop further the shifts in tone and approach of media coverage of the monarchy, and the Establishment generally, citing increasing competition and the advent of continuous news programming as significant factors in any change. They should recognise the intense interest that surrounded the personal life of Princess Diana and the near hysteria at the news of her death and be aware of how this impacted on the coverage of the royal family and the image of the monarchy as an institution generally. There may also be some reference to the increasing focus on ‘celebrity’ and the concomitant rise in intrusive journalistic practices. Candidates should be rewarded for their ability to exemplify their arguments with references to specific programmes or news reports, although this is not a prerequisite for a good answer. Achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of the sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the effect of media intrusion into the lives of the royal family, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>